



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/532,673

04/26/2005

Michihiko Takase

2005_0642A

8711

52349 7590 01/27/2011
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

BURKHART, ELIZABETH A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1715

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/27/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 1/5/2011 has been entered since it does not change the scope of the claims. The amended claims would be rejected as set forth in the previous Office Action which is reproduced below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintani (JP 11-080952) in view of Hidaka et al (JP 10-106441, machine translation submitted 7/28/08), Kim et al, and Okuyama et al (JP 2001-243886, submitted 7/28/08).

Shintani teaches a process for forming an MgO film onto a substrate of an AC type plasma display panel [0002] comprising: controlling a vacuum degree in the deposition room within a certain range, introducing oxygen into the deposition room, and controlling a partial pressure of the oxygen gas introduced to said deposition room within a certain range (Abstract). The oxygen partial pressure is kept within a certain range by controlling an amount of oxygen introduced into the deposition room while the deposition room is exhausted [0004].

Shintani does not teach introducing another gas including at least one gas selected from the group consisting of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide; the partial

Art Unit: 1715

pressure of the oxygen gas; the partial pressure of the another gas; or that an inert gas is introduced for controlling degree of vacuum.

Hidaka discloses forming an MgO protective layer for a plasma display panel wherein steam is introduced, in addition to oxygen, to the evaporation chamber at a specific partial pressure in order to enhance the crystal orientation of the MgO film (Abstract). The secondary emission coefficient changes with crystal orientation of an MgO film ([0003] of machine translation).

Kim discloses that the secondary emission coefficient changes for an MgO film with exposure to water vapor or carbon dioxide (p. 5, col. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to introduce water vapor (i.e. steam) as suggested by Hidaka during the process of Shintani in order to enhance the crystal orientation of the MgO film. Further, it would have been obvious to use carbon dioxide as suggested by Kim as an alternative to the water vapor of Hidaka since carbon dioxide changes the secondary emission coefficient of the MgO film similarly to water vapor.

Okuyama teaches a method for forming an MgO film on a plasma display panel (Abstract) wherein a mixed gas containing an inert gas and oxygen may be introduced to the chamber during deposition in order to control membranous quality of the film. Okuyama also teaches that the introduction of oxygen reduces oxygen deficiency [0025] which restrains the amount of dangling bonds (as evidenced by p. 8, line 15 of instant specification).

Art Unit: 1715

It would have been obvious to incorporate an inert gas into the process of Shintani as suggested by Okuyama in order to control the membranous quality of the film. Since Shintani teaches controlling the amount of gas (oxygen) introduced, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to control the amount of any gases being introduced, such as inert gas, to maintain the desired degree of vacuum.

Regarding Claim 21, Hidaka discloses an oxygen partial pressure and steam (or carbon dioxide as suggested by Kim) partial pressure within the claimed ranges (Abstract). Further, one of ordinary skill would have expected similar results using carbon monoxide since it has similar structure and properties to carbon dioxide.

Regarding Claim 27, Shintani teaches an apparatus for depositing an MgO film for manufacturing a plasma display panel, the apparatus comprising: a deposition room, a gas introducing means for introducing oxygen gas (nozzle), an exhausting means (pressure control valve), a partial pressure detecting means for detecting partial pressure of the oxygen gas (mass spectrometer), a vacuum degree detecting means (vacuum meter), and a controlling means for controlling the amount of oxygen gas introduced to said deposition room (mass flow controller) and for controlling the amount of exhausting gas (pressure computing unit) based on information from the partial pressure detecting means and vacuum degree detecting means [0002], [0004]-[0006]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to incorporate other MFC's into the apparatus of Shintani to accomodate gases other than oxygen, such as those suggested by Hidaka, in order to enhance crystal orientation of the MgO film and to independently detect the partial pressure of each gas since Hidaka teaches maintaining

Art Unit: 1715

the additional gas (water vapor or carbon dioxide as suggested by Kim) within a specific partial pressure range and the MFC of Shintani is suitable for maintaining a specific partial pressure of gas as shown with oxygen.

Thus, claims 21 and 27 would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103 over the combined teachings of Shintani, Hidaka, and Kim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 21 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of copending Application No. 10/532672 in view of Hidaka et al (JP 10-106441) and Kim et al. The '672 application teaches a method of manufacturing a PDP comprising every limitation of claim 21 except the metal oxide being magnesium oxide and the partial pressures of the oxygen

Art Unit: 1715

gas and other gas (carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide) being controlled within a certain range. Hidaka discloses forming an MgO protective layer for a plasma display panel wherein steam is introduced, in addition to oxygen, to the evaporation chamber at a specific partial pressure (within the claimed range) in order to enhance the crystal orientation of the MgO film. Hidaka also discloses an oxygen partial pressure within the claimed range (Abstract) and that the secondary emission coefficient changes with crystal orientation of an MgO film ([0003] of machine translation). Kim discloses that the secondary emission coefficient changes for an MgO film with exposure to water vapor or carbon dioxide (p. 5, col. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to introduce oxygen and another gas (i.e. steam) at a partial pressure suggested by Hidaka during the process of '672 in order to enhance the crystal orientation of the MgO film. Further, it would have been obvious to use carbon dioxide as suggested by Kim as an alternative to the water vapor of Hidaka since carbon dioxide changes the secondary emission coefficient of the MgO film similarly to water vapor. Further, one of ordinary skill would have expected similar results using carbon monoxide since it has similar structure and properties to carbon dioxide.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the cited prior art discloses a gas that is capable of including carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, or carbon monoxide and carbon

Art Unit: 1715

dioxide. The Examiner disagrees. Hidaka discloses forming an MgO protective layer for a plasma display panel wherein steam is introduced, in addition to oxygen, to the evaporation chamber at a specific partial pressure in order to enhance the crystal orientation of the MgO film (Abstract). The secondary emission coefficient changes with crystal orientation of an MgO film ([0003] of machine translation). Kim discloses that the secondary emission coefficient changes for an MgO film with exposure to water vapor or **carbon dioxide** (p. 5, col. 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to use carbon dioxide as suggested by Kim as an alternative to the water vapor of Hidaka since carbon dioxide changes the secondary emission coefficient of the MgO film similarly to water vapor. The claim language allows the another gas to include carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, **or** a combination of both. Further, one of ordinary skill would have expected similar results using carbon monoxide since it has similar structure and properties to carbon dioxide.

4. Applicant argues that the partial pressures provided for oxygen and steam (i.e. carbon dioxide as taught by Kim) in Hidaka do not fall within the ranges set forth in claim 21. The Examiner disagrees. Hidaka discloses an oxygen partial pressure of 1×10^{-4} torr (Abstract) which is 1.33×10^{-2} Pa. This value falls within the claimed oxygen range of claim 21. Hidaka discloses a steam partial pressure (alternatively a CO₂ partial pressure as taught by Kim) of **not more than** 5×10^{-4} torr (Abstract, [0013] of machine translation), which is not more than 6.6×10^{-2} Pa. The range given in Hidaka (i.e. less than or equal to 6.6×10^{-2} Pa) includes values which fall within the claimed carbon dioxide range. Further, one of ordinary skill would have expected similar results using

Art Unit: 1715

carbon monoxide since it has similar structure and properties to carbon dioxide and would have expected to use similar conditions (i.e. partial pressure) as used for carbon dioxide. The range given in Hidaka for carbon dioxide (i.e. less than or equal to 6.6×10^{-2} Pa) includes values which fall within the claimed carbon monoxide range.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH BURKHART whose telephone number is (571)272-6647. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,673

Page 9

Art Unit: 1715

/Elizabeth Burkhart/
Examiner, Art Unit 1715

/Timothy H Meeks/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1715